

Theological 123.

THE
CHURCH
IN
PERILS
AMONG

False Brethren;

OR,

The Danger of the Church from
her pretended *Friends* but se-
cret *Enemies*, review'd.

IN WHICH,

Objections against the Repeal of
SACRAMENTAL - TESTS, and
the Arguments for it, are consider'd
in their Religious and Political As-
pects.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. ROBERTS near the *Oxford-Arms* in *Warwick-Lane*,
A. DODD at the *Peacock* without *Temple-bar*, and H. WHIT-
RIDGE at the *Royal-Exchange*. 1733. [Price Six-pence.]

THE
CHURCH
IN
PERILS

False Brethren;



The Danger of the Church from
Internal Enemies, and the
Need of a New Review.

Objections against the Report of
the Select Committee on the
State of the Church, and
the Proposed Reforms.



T H E
CHURCH in PERILS
A M O N G
FALSE BRETHREN.



SOME time after the Restoration, the Parliament having no Problems to puzzle their brains with, grew indolent and supine : but when alarm'd with Popery advancing towards 'em, and an Army form'd in favour of it, lying encamp'd at *Blackbeath*, conducted by Colonel *Fitzgerald* an *Irish* Papist, they awake out of their Lethargy ; and wisely, as they thought, provide for their own Security by Ecclesiastical Circumvallations.

THAT Parliament, having by the *Uniformity-Act* garbl'd the Church, and turn'd out of it the Sons of Moderation, pass a Law to discover
Papists

Papists, who begun to conceive mighty hopes from that Brand of Infamy, and Disgrace, put upon those ejected Protestants.

BY this Law, *contriv'd against popish Recusants*, 'twas enacted, *that no Person should hold any Place of Trust, Profit or Honour, without receiving the Sacrament according to the Usage of the Church of England.*—

THUS one of the visible and awful Solemnities in the Christian Institution was made a *conditio sine qua non* to worldly Preferments. How agreeable such Practice may be to the Maxims of Reason and Christianity, is the subject of our present Enquiry; and if the Doubt be not solv'd by Dint of Prejudice and Interest, I flatter myself with a Belief, that *Dagon* will fall before the *Ark*, and *Christ* triumph over *Mammon*.

Two things here offer themselves to our Consideration, *viz.*

1. *The Apology usually made by Church-Men in favour of the Test, or their Objections against the Repeal.*

2. *The Arguments urg'd by Protestant Dissenters for its Repeal.* I begin with the Objections, which are two.

I. OBJECTION.

The first Objection against the Repeal of the Test that's generally us'd, is its being *the grand Security of the Church*: *to repeal it would be to demolish one of the strong Holds of Sion.*

None

None but constant Church-men can be its Defenders, therefore none but such should be prefer'd, and such as take the Test according to its Usage.

IN answer to this Objection, I must observe, that it is one intire Falshood, and contrary to historical Facts; as will appear from the two following Propositions, *viz.*

1. *That the Test-Act does not require constant Conformity.*

2. *That those who took the Test for Places, were the only Persons that betray'd the Church.*

That the Sacramental-Test is no real Security to the Church is (upon her own Principles) evident; because

I. *That Act does not require constant and plenary Compliance with the Liturgy.*

Nor will constant Conformity entitle any Persons to Preferment without taking the Sacrament upon that occasion; for the Law ordains one particular Participation of the Lord's Supper for that very Preferment, which the Receiver has in possession.

THE Act requires no other Conformity but what is Occasional, and that only in one single Act, *i. e.* Receiving the Sacrament; and when he has done that, he has secur'd his Place, tho he never enter the Church Doors again.

BUT why a Person, in stated Communion with the Church, should not be prefer'd without a special use of the Sacrament for that secular Purpose, is what I understand not.

It

IT looks as if there were some Charm in it, when taken in obedience to Humane Authority, which it is destitute of, when taken in compliance with the Divine Precept. He who goes to Church but once, to receive the Sacrament for his Admission to a Place, and Continuance in it, let him be never so Heterodox and profligate, yet by this Act he is counted an Orthodox Saint; when *Constant Conformity* gives no right to a Place without a *special use* of the *Sacred Ordinance* for that purpose.

IN a late Reign some Gentlemen who took the Test being aware of this, brought in a Bill to turn Occasional into Constant Conformity; pretendedly in defence of the Church, when in reality the Scheme was calculated in favour of the *Chevalier*, and therefore was repeal'd.

BUT after all, what Security can the Test be against Papists? when a Dispensation from *Rome* would annihilate all their Scruples about it, and some of 'em have actually receiv'd the Sacrament in the Established Church, as Sir *Philip Tyrwhit*, A. D. 1676.

IT'S observable, that *Walker* the Head of *University College*, and five or six more at *Oxford* declar'd themselves *Papists*, but with this Infamy, that they had continued several Years in the Worship of the *Church of England* after their Reconciliation to the *Church of Rome*: *Burnet's History*, A. D. 1686.

The other Day a certain *Popish Lady* in *Yorkshire*, *Patroness* of a certain Church, in order to qualify herself to present a Friend to the Place,

Place, did renounce the Romish Religion, and conform'd to the *Church of England*, took the Test, and when all was over, she returned to the *Church of Rome*. Upon this I would ask, in what respect the Test is a Security of the Church? unless the Test engages the Minds of those who take it to a lasting Veneration for the Church, it does nothing; but the Story before us is a palpable instance, that a Test-taker may be only a Self-pleaser, and therefore to plead for it as the defence of the Church, is to ascribe what does not belong to it. The Sacramental Test is no Security to the Church; because,

II. *THE Church has been in the greatest Danger from those who took the Test for Places.* Yea those have been the most flagrant and flagitious Betrayers of the Church, and that in all Reigns, viz of *King Charles II. James II. William III. Queen Ann, King George I.* I'll begin with the Danger of the Church from that Government under which the Test-Act was contriv'd.

AND what was the Government of *King Charles II.* but one continued scene of Treachery against the Protestant Religion, and the Church of *England* at the Head of that Religion? The Betrayers of the Church then were found only among those who comply'd with the Test-Act, and always conform'd; without whose Countenance and Connivance no papal Intrigues had prevail'd against the Church, no not in *King James's* time.

After

AFTER his Act past against Papists, none so carest, and so highly favour'd by our Rulers as Papists. Their Persons were safe, and Mass-houses remained untouched, when Dissenting Protestants were every where cruelly harraßt.

THE Court, in spite of all Tests, was soon turned into *Chambers of Imagery*. All Preferences were under the Direction of a Popish Duke, who with his royal Brother were engaged in a Conspiracy with *Rome* and *France* against the *Church of England*. The Dissenters being, in their opinion, the People that stood most in their way, their Suppression was resolv'd on, and those who had taken the Test carry'd on their Prosecution against them with the utmost Virulency ; as if the *Protestants in the Church* were in no danger but from *Protestants without the Church*.

NOR was the Nation convinc'd of this Error, till the Triple League was dissolv'd, and they saw bare-faced Popery at their doors, and the Power by Sea and Land lodg'd in hands Popishly affected. This Conviction was not so universal, but still *in the Church were found Enemies to the Church* ; and now it was, the Distinction between the Court and Country Party made its Appearance in that Reign.

THOSE who oppos'd the *Bill of Exclusion*, and voted a Popish Prince to be the Defender of a Protestant Church, were all Gentlemen who by solemn Oaths and Tests undertook to be Guardians of the Church. Even the *Episcopal Bench* voted for a *Popish Successor* ; and how

con-

consistent that was with the Parliamentary Test, and other Securities given by their Lordships, I determine not.

KING *Charles* (now he had set the Church party at such a distance from the Dissenters) concluded it was impossible, to make 'em join in opposition to his Efforts in favour of *Rome*. What farther animated that Prince was, that the Church had warmly espous'd the *Doctrines of Passive Obedience and Non Resistance*, which now were become the *Shibboleth* of the Party in the Pulpit and Press.

FROM thence his Majesty infer'd *those of the Church* would be always flexible, submissive and ductile, therefore had nothing to fear from that quarter. And as to the *Dissenters*, he had 'em at his Mercy, being under the Lash of the penal Laws; and he would either crush 'em at home, or force them to quit the Kingdom.

IN the year 1682, *Cities, Corporations and Boroughs*, contrary to other solemn Engagements as well as the Test their Magistrates had taken, surrender'd their Charters, and took new ones modell'd by a Court that was absolutely devoted to a Popish Interest. This ignominious Surrender those Test-takers made in breach of another Oath they had taken, *viz. that they would not at any time endeavour any Alteration of Government in Church or State.*

IN the new Charters were Regulations contrary to Law, by which shameful Artifice they made no doubt of chusing a Parliament, that would pave the way for a Popish Succession.

N. B. It was not in the Power of Papists to do all this, without Protestant Help; and no Protestants were in Power, but such as had taken the Test.

THIS perhaps made a certain House of Commons once tell King *Charles II.* that *Popery had rather gain'd than lost ground since the Test.*

SOME honest Church Men observing the melancholy Consequences that attended the Marriages of our Kings with Papists, brought in a Bill that they should be marry'd to none but Protestants: this was rejected by the unanimous Votes of the *Bishops Bench*, call'd therefore, by the Lay-Lords, *the Dead Weight*. Now if the Members of the Church, who take the Test, oppose its Interests; if the dignified Members of it thus war against it, it is evident that the Test is so far from being a Guard to the Church, that it only qualifies Persons to be the Disturbers of its Peace.

WHEN King *James* mounted the Saddle, his first work was, to lull the Church asleep by fair Promises in his Speech; a Speech that made the Pulpits sound with Thanksgivings: yea that fallacious Speech was magnify'd by some of those who had taken the Test, as a Security far greater than what *Tests and Laws* could give. The common Phrase then was, *James the Just, we have the Word of a King, a Word never yet broken*; so says *Bishop Burnet's History*, ad an. 1685.

THE next thing he did, was to prove King
Charles

Charles a Papist, and which he publish'd to the World ; artfully insinuating thereby, that a Popish King was no such strange or dangerous Creature in *England*.

SOON after, by virtue of new-model'd Charters, he procur'd a venal Parliament, a packt Assembly, who after most of their leading Men had taken the Test, immediately run into the Court-Measures, joining with a corrupt Ministry to inflame our religious Differences, and make Protestants devour one another, and in projecting Laws against those who oppos'd the Court-Projects, that were all fram'd and form'd in favour of Popery.

THUS a Parliament directed and manag'd by those that had taken the *Test* in defence of the Church, past Acts in favour of a Popish King, even then when he sat on the Throne, meditating Mischief against the Church.

IT was in this Reign that ten Judges out of 12, all of whom must have receiv'd the Test, declar'd, *that the King had Power to dispense with the Test and other Penal Laws, that were made for the Safety of the Church.*

THE Episcopal Historian says, *Some of the Bishops that were gain'd by the Court carry'd their Compliance to a shameful Pitch — that they sent Addresses of Thanks for the King's Promise of maintaining the Church of England, tho it was visible that the Intent of it was to destroy the Church.* Burnet's History 1687.

IN this Reign also a new Ecclesiastical Court

was erected, contrary to Law. The Persons in whom this Commission (so dangerous to the Church) was lodg'd, were the *Archbishop of Canterbury* (who after some time refus'd to act) the *Bishop of Durham*, *Bishop of Rochester*, Lord *Jeffreys*, Earl of *Rochester* Lord High Treasurer, Earl of *Sunderland*, Sir *Edward Herbert* Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.

THIS Court was erected as a *Battery* against the *Church*; the Commissioners who were the Executioners of this Dispensing Power were Bishops, and Gentlemen who by their Places had taken the Test, and here they are actually employ'd in Agency for Popery against the Church.

UPON Aug. 3. 1686. they open'd their Commission, and begun with suspending the *Bishop of London*, for Disobedience to the King in not suspending Dr. *Sharp*. Then proceeded against others (who were true Friends to the Church) and suspended Dr. *Peachel* Vice-chancellor of *Cambridge*, for refusing one *Alban Francis* a *Benedictine Monk* the Degree of Master of Arts, without taking the usual Tests according to Law. About the same time, Dr. *Hough*, President of *Magdalen College Oxford*, was made a Victim to their Rage. See this Commission at large in Mr *Coke's Detection*.

WERE they not Gentlemen who had taken the Test, that managed Affairs in Parliament, when King *James* was supplied with Money to raise and maintain an Army to pull down the Church? yea, says *Bishop Burnet*, " The
" Par-

“ Parliament granted every thing that was
 “ ask’d, with such a Profusion that the House
 “ was more forward to give than the King
 “ was to ask ; to which the King put a stop
 “ by a Message, intimating that he desired no
 “ more Money that Session.” *A. D.* 1685.

ANOTHER remarkable Incident was, that when King *James* told the Parliament, that he had prefer’d some Popish Officers who were not qualify’d according to the *Test-Act*, and that he would not put the Affront on them and on himself to turn ’em out, even this was consented to, and he was thank’d for it.

“ THE Lords thank’d the King for his most
 “ gracious Speech. But the brave *Earl of*
 “ *Devonshire* had the Courage and Honesty
 “ to distinguish himself by saying, *he was for*
 “ *giving Thanks too, because his Majesty had*
 “ *spoken out so plainly, and warn’d ’em of*
 “ *what they might look for.*”

THE House of Commons not only thank the King for his most gracious Speech, but told his Majesty — *that they were preparing a Bill to pass both Houses, for his Majesty’s royal Assent, to indemnify those Popish Officers ; that is, to qualify ’em to serve in the Army without taking the Test.*

HERE both Houses thank his Majesty for a Speech made in favour of *Popish Officers* prefer’d contrary to Law. And this by the Management of some, whose Places had obliged them to take the Test. Thus, Church! thou art wounded in the House of thy Friends.

IN this melancholy Crisis of Things, Mr. *Samuel Johnson*, an honest Clergyman, writ an Address to the *English* Protestants in King *James's* Army, cautioning 'em against Popery; for which he was try'd, and condemn'd to be whipt from *Newgate* to *Tyburn*, and the Sentence was executed in the most barbarous Manner.

AND would you think it? they were three Bishops, (viz. Dr. *Crew* Bishop of *Durham*, Dr. *Sprat* Bishop of *Rocheſter*, Dr. *White* Bishop of *Peterborough*) perform'd the Drudgery of degrading (or unordaining) that Reverend and learned Divine.

I HAVE only to add here, that *certain Doctrines* coin'd at the *Universities*, and enforce'd by the *Anathemas* of the Pulpit in the *Caroline* Reign, made an easy Passage for current Popery in the *Jacobine* Reign.

NOR has the *Sacramental-Test* been more happy in its Operation since the glorious Revolution. The Church since that *Memorable Epoch* has been often in *Danger*, but always from her own Sons; who under pretence of due regards to a good Mother took the Test for Preference from her own hands, and then impiously betray'd her.

WHO oppos'd the Abdication of a Popish Prince, a Prince who had imprison'd our Bishops? Who oppos'd the Settlement of the Crown in the Protestant Line for the future Safety of the Church? who, but Gentlemen that for one or other Place had taken the Test?

IN

IN the Parliament 1689. many Members of the *High Party*, who by taking the *Test* had qualify'd 'emselfes for *high Places*, urged hard for calling back *King James* from *France*; where he, in conjunction with his old Friend the *French King*, were preparing an Army to destroy our Constitution in Church and State: while those who were no Friends to that Religious Test in worldly Affairs, declar'd they would never give their Vote for clapping a Popish Head upon the Shoulders of a Protestant Church.

WHO set up a *Jacobite Church of England*, and peremptorily confin'd Salvation to it, in opposition to the *Establish'd Church*, which they charg'd with damnable Schism? Who clamour'd against the Revolution, and reckoned those in the Classis of Presbyterians that espous'd the Revolution Principles? Principles by which the Church was rescued from the Paws of a raging Lion, even when it seem'd fully possess'd of its Prey. I ask who were those that thus betray'd the Church? Who but men that made their way to Preferment by the Altar?

WHO join'd with Papists in forming the *Assassination-Plot* to murder *King William*, but Gentlemen, who were in Communion with the Church, as *Sir John Friend*, *Sir William Perkins*, *Mr Cranburn* — A. D. 1695-6. who were number'd among the Non-associators upon the Detection of that horrid Conspiracy against his Majesty's Life.

IN the same Category we must rank those who hung upon the Wheels of the Administration, and betray'd the King's Counsels to the *French*; Counsels that were calculated in favour of the Church, against the united Force of Papal Powers?

WHO embarass the national Affairs at home, and cut the King off with short Allowances in *Flanders*, when he was *jeoparding his Life for the Church, in the High Places of the field*? Who were those, but Gentlemen that had climb'd to high Stations by eating and drinking the consecrated Elements?

WHO thwarted *King William* in his Project of strengthening the Church by an honourable Comprehension? Only those Test-men, those angry Sons of a good-humour'd Mother who would have none rise in the Scale of Honour but themselves.

IN *Queen Ann's* Reign were many bold Advances made towards restoring a Popish Pretender: but by whom? why by those who had solemnly abjur'd him, and pretended to confirm their Abjuration by taking the sacred Viands upon their Knees. Yet had these Traytors the front to christen 'emselfes the true Sons of the Church; but with what Propriety let the World judge.

WHY was the *Duke of Marlborough* turn'd out of all his Employments, and that by an Army of Test-men? why because he had conquer'd the *French King*, the *Pretender's* avowed Patron. One Campaign more made by his Grace would

those would very probably have display'd the *English* Banner in the Bowels of *France*.

THE Prospect of such a Catastrophe could not but sensibly touch the *Jacobites*, and the High-flying Test-men; for if *Lewis le Grand* was reduced, what would become of their *Petit Roy*, their little *Impotent Idol*, that was never yet able to go without Crutches? Political Clamours were rais'd and industriously spread against the *Duke*, which ended in his Dismission, to the unspeakable Satisfaction of *France* and its unnatural Adherents in this divided Nation.

TOWARDS the latter End of her Majesty's Reign, Popery, and Protestant Test-takers at the head of it, attack'd Church and State in form. An easterly Current carry'd away all Preferments. The Protestant Succession undermin'd by conforming Protestants: The Number of *Jacobites* daily increas'd upon disbanding our Forces, and discharging a Ministry that was firmly attach'd to the *Hannover* Succession.

"THE Army was reduced to 7000, as it was reasonably thought, to favour the Introduction of the Pretender." And this was done by those who had taken the Test and other Engagements to keep him out.

IT is remarkable, when the Queen's Ministers (in 1714) were remov'd, there were ten *Jacobites* to One who could be found when those Ministers came into power, viz. 1710.

UNDER this new Ministry, the Pretender's Friends soon grew to that pitch of Insolence,

lence, as publickly to assert his Right, and to drink his Health. Above a hundred Irish Papists had (June 24, 1714.) a Feast at the Sun-Tavern in the Strand, of which the Lord Fingall was chosen Steward, and to which Gentlemen were admitted by a printed Ticket, in which was the Image of a Pope or some Popish Saint, treading Heresy, or Protestant Religion, under foot.

IF the Gentlemen who were then at the Helm, and had taken the Test, did not countenance those Imps of Impudence, the most sawcy Priest in the pack durst not have run such lengths as he did. Thus were the Romish Vipers countenanced under the Nose of the Court, and Swarms of Romish Emissaries suffer'd to go about without controul.

AFTER this, you'll not wonder to hear that Sir John Gipson, Deputy Governor of *Portsmouth*, writ to the Secretary of State, that he had certain Intelligence of great Preparations then making at *Havre de Grace* in *France*, for an imbarkation of Troops, in order to bring over the Pretender; but no notice was taken of his Information — nor of the Representation he made about that important Fortrefs, that it wanted both Men and warlike Stores. *Political State for July 1714. Vol. VIII. p. 68.*

SHOULD I account for all those who took the Church-Test, and then betray'd the Church; especially in the four last Years of Queen *Anne's* Reign, I must transcribe the History of those melancholy Times at large, since almost all

all Promotions conspir'd, to defeat the Succession of the Crown in the Protestant Line.

THE Transactions of those dark Days are recent, and in our minds, therefore no further Animadversion is necessary, but this, *viz.*

THAT those Gentlemen, who then essay'd to bring in a Popish Pretender, were in Communion with the Church; and, before they betray'd her, very gravely kneel'd before the Altar for her Blessing.

LET the World then judge, what little Stress is to be laid upon a Test, that has been so much and so long magnify'd as the great Blockade and Bulwark of Church and State: A Bulwark, which upon due Examination, shrinks into a broken Reed, piercing some, and serving only to enrich others who traffick for this World.

As a Supplement to this, I recommend the Reader to a little Pamphlet newly publish'd and entitl'd, *The Craftsman's Doctrine and Practice*, in which you'll find irrefragable Instances of a most treacherous Conduct (during the four last Years of the Queen's Reign) in those who possess'd the highest Seats of Administration, and who had gone thro' the Solemnity of the qualifying Article; without which it had not been in their Power to shew such remarkable Inveteracy to the *House of Hannover*, and make such Dispositions to introduce a *Romish Pretender*. But when the fatal Stroke was ready to be given, Heaven look'd down, and *took up* the Queen, and divided the Scepter from the Royal hand.

IN King *George* the first's Reign, the Test-Act was not able to keep Traytors and Rebels out of the Administration.

THE Rebellion rais'd against his Majesty, and crush'd at *Preston*, was headed by Gentlemen, who were in visible Communion with the Church, and at the same time in conjunction with *Papists*.

Now if the Test-Act has been no Security to the Church, why may it not be repeal'd without running any Risk or Danger? especially since the Church may be more effectually secur'd by that Goodness in her Laws, which has wrought such wonders in the temper of her Bishops, to reconcile Multitudes of late to her Communion.

SINCE the Church has been always in danger from those who were prefer'd by the Test, I see no reason why she should be so fond of the mistaken Barrier.

BUT after all, if the Sacramental-Test has been any ways serviceable to the Church, they are oblig'd to the Dissenters for it. The Reason is, because they had an Interest in the House and might have opposed it: why then, you'll say, did they consent to it?

(1.) BECAUSE it was then thought to be a good Defense against Popery.

(2.) BECAUSE the Dissenters had Assurances given them of being guarded against any Inconveniences that might arise from it to themselves. But more of this further on.

II. OBJECTION.

THE next Objection against the Repeal of the Test-Act, is *that the Dissenting Protestants are Enemies to the Church. In the Civil Wars, it was demolish'd by them; therefore, not safe to trust 'em with Places any more.*

I answer, That whatever was done to serve worldly Purposes under a religious Pretext was ill done, by whomsoever it was done. What has the Church of Christ to do with worldly Places? and what has the World to do with a Christian Church? *The Christian Religion*, says Mr. Law, *rankes the present World along with the Flesh and the Devil, as an equal Enemy to those glorious ends, which our Redemption proposes: Christian Perfection*, p. 67-9.

THE Protestant Dissenters had just Reasons to complain of cruel usage in the Reigns of the two Brothers, by which many thousand Families were ruin'd, yet never lift up a hand against their Persecutors, nor molested the Government in Church and State, by Tumults, Insurrections, Mobbing, Demolition of Churches, as some of the Church have done.

It's now near sixty Years since the *Test-Act* past, and have not the Dissenters ever since given sufficient Demonstrations of their Loyalty to the State, and Promptness to support the Church upon all dangerous Emergencies? which leads me to the main Article, *viz.* to shew,

THAT

THAT the Protestant Dissenters are, and have been real Friends to the Church, and what is more, she always found them so in the time of her Adversity.

THIS Proposition will maintain itself by the ensuing Illustrations.

1. THE Danger of the Church before the Existence of the Test was from her own Members.

2. HER Deliverance from that Danger was by the Agency of Protestant Dissenters.

3. AFTER the Test Law was in force, the Church was never betrayed, but by those who took the Test for Places as before.

4. IT was by the friendly Assistance of Dissenters that she was rescu'd out of the hands of those Betrayers.

5. WHEN it was in their Power to distress the Church, and they were prompted thereto by the Head of it, they despis'd the Motion and adher'd to her.

(1) THE Danger of the Church before the Existence of the Test was from her own Members, who begun the Civil War, that ended in the overthrow of the Church.

AND how far the first Beginners of a Quarrel are accountable for Consequences, I determine not. In this Dispute 'tis not material who first unsheath'd the Sword; but to suppose the Dissenters significant enough at that Time, to produce such a mighty Revolution, is a very wild Conceit.

THE Truth is, that War was meditated not by *Dissenters*, but by the *Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled*; a Parliament who were compos'd of honest Churchmen, who stood up in Defense of Liberty and Property, that were openly attack'd by absolute and unlimited Power.

“ *Monsieur Marville* says, that the first
 “ Source of all the *Troubles* in *England* was
 “ from that Prince, who said soon after he
 “ came to the Throne, that he would resume
 “ the *Church-lands* out of the hands of the
 “ Nobility, with whom *Henry VIII.* had
 “ shar'd them. He says, that it was the *Earl*
 “ of *Clarendon* who spoke this, when he was
 “ in *France*, and that no other Historian of
 “ any Nation takes notice of that Circum-
 “ stance.” See *Melanges d' Histoire, & de*
Lit. collected by Monsieur de Vigneul Marville,
Amsterdam 1700.

IN *Ireland*, the King weaken'd the State to strengthen the Church; for by the mediation of Archbishop *Laud*, he restored to the Church all the Improvements then in the Crown. *Baker*, 454.

THE Criminals of those Days, whoever they were, having past their Accounts beyond the Grave, there we leave them; and only observe, that the Murderers of that unfortunate King were men of different Principles from those who solicit for the Repeal, and who have that tragical Act in equal Abhorrence with their neighbours.

AND

AND as an Evidence of this, about 60 Presbyterian Ministers in and about *London* drew up and sign'd a *Remonstrance* to the *Lord General*, declaring their Abhorrence of all Violence against the Person of the King, and urging him and his Army to take heed of such an Action, and presented it to him when they apprehended the King to be in danger. A Crime *Oliver* would never forgive them.

N. B. THE Presbyterians were the only Persons, who in Form and in a Body protested boldly against the King's Death.

NAY further, Mr. *Calamy* and other Presbyterian Ministers, went to persuade the General of the Army, to rescue the King, but they were not allow'd to speak to him. *Vid. Complete History of England, Vol. III.*

CALL us therefore no more the Children of 41, since the Actors in that War were the Representatives of the Nation: and let those also who are so ready to touch upon 48, take into the account 88, and try the Difference between cutting off the Father's Head, and burying his Son alive. 'Tis palpable Error to impute that tragical Day to the Dissenters, who in that Juncture had little Influence and less Power. Let not the Church therefore weep for us, but let it weep for itself and for its own guilty Sons.

2. THE Deliverance of the Church from its Overthrow under OLIVER, was by the Agency of Protestant Dissenters.

THERE

THERE needs no other proof of this Proposition than their Restoration of *King Charles*, the Head and Minion of the Church. The *Parliament* that restor'd the King was then generally reputed *Presbyterians*. Strange Vicissitudes in about 20 years time ! A conforming Parliament begun the War, in which one King was murder'd, and another King was banish'd ; that very War engender'd a Race of Nonconformists, *who fetch'd home the Bannished*.

MY Lord Clarendon observes, “ that with
 “ the Commissioners from the Parliament and
 “ from the City, to *King Charles*, there came
 “ a company of their Clergymen, 8 or 10, as
 “ Dr. *Reynolds*, Dr. *Manton*, Mr. *Calamy*,
 “ and others, the most eminent of the *Presby-*
 “ *terian Divines*, to whom the King spake
 “ very kindly, and said *he had heard of their*
 “ *good Behaviour towards him*. Clarendon's
 “ *Hist. Vol. III. Part II. Oxford Edition,*
 “ *Book 16. p. 770.*

THIS *Parliament* that voted home the King, appointed a *day of Fasting and Prayer*, at which 3 *Presbyterian Ministers* assisted, Dr. *Manton*, Mr. *Calamy* and Mr. *Bowles*. The King being fixt on the Throne, several *Presbyterian Ministers* were made his Majestys Chaplains, viz. Mr. *Calamy*, Dr. *Reynolds*, Dr. *Spurflow*, Dr. *Wallis*, Dr. *Bates*, Dr. *Manton*, Mr. *Baxter*——Several *Presbyterian Ministers*, in consideration of their Services, and Adherence to the King, were offer'd great Preferments in the
 D Church.

Church. Mr. *Calamy* had the Bishoprick of *Litchfield and Coventry* offer'd to him, Dr. *Reynolds* the Bishoprick of *Norwich*, Mr. *Baxter* that of *Hereford*. To Dr. *Manton* was offer'd the Deanery of *Rochester*, to Dr. *Bates* that of *Coventry*, to Mr. *Edward Bowles* that of *York*, but all refus'd, (except Dr. *Reynolds*) because they could not with a safe Conscience comply with the Terms of Conformity. If they were not the King's Friends, whence all this?

AGAIN, the Army, without which the King would not have been restor'd, was by this time grown into an Army of Protestant Dissenters; which my Lord *Clarendon* describes to be "no less than invincible, whose
" Discipline, Sobriety, Courage and Success,
" had made it famous and terrible over the
" World."

THIS, as I take it, was deliver'd by his Lordship in presence of the King, in a Speech to the Parliament. 13 September, 1660.

HIS Lordship further observes, that Sir *Arthur Forbes*, a Scots Gentleman, was sent by Sir *Charles Coote* to the Marquis of *Ormond* at *Brussels*, that he might assure his Majesty, that *Ireland* was well affected; that the present Power in *England* had removed all the sober Men from the Government of the State in *Ireland*, under the Character of *Presbyterians*, and had put *Ludlow*, *Corbet*, and others of the King's Judges in their Places. *Ibid. supra.*
P. 755.

SIR

SIR *Richard Baker* goes yet further, and says, that the first Rising in favour of *King Charles's Restoration* was to be of such as had never engag'd on the King's Side in the late Wars—*Chron. Edit. 8. p. 649.*

3. THE Church, since the passing the Test Law, was always betray'd by those who took the Test with secular Views.

HAVING prov'd this Charge before, I shall only add, that Popery which was propagated in *King Charles the Second's* Reign triumph'd in that of *King James II.* which it could never have done in these Reigns without the treacherous Conduct of those who had taken the Test.

KING *James*, you'll say, was a Papist, and what less could be expected from him? true, but who made him King? not Dissenters but the Church. Dissenters joined with the Low Church in *King Charles's* Reign to exclude him from the Crown, because he was a Papist, but the Bishops of *those Days*, 1678, threw out the Bill. I say of *those Days*, for we have reason to entertain better Sentiments of Gentlemen preferr'd to the Mitre since the happy Revolution.

IN that Year an Act of Parliament pass, requiring the Members of both Houses, and all such as might come into the King's Court and Presence, to take a Test against Popery, to renounce Transubstantiation, the Adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass—but the Duke of York,

the avowed Patron of Popery, was by a particular Proviso, exempted from this Oath, by which a wide Gap was left open for the Pope's triumphant Entrance. *N. B.* Here is an Oath made to renounce the Pope and all his Works, but he who was the only Man in *England* that could bring in Popery, is exempted from it.

THE Duke, in all *King Charles's* Reign, (notwithstanding his Denudation, 1673.) was Regent. Some Years after was a remarkable Trial at *Lancaster*, the occasion this; one *Mr. Bell* a young Clergyman, Son to the *Parson of Heighton near Liverpool*, being in Company with some of his Brethren propos'd this Health, viz. *God bless the King, and Devil take the Regent*: *Mr. Zach. Taylor, Parson of Wigan*, informed against him. *Mr. Dormer*, I think was Counsel for the Defendant, who was fin'd 100*l*. I thank your Lordship, said *Mr. Bell*, for I did verily imagine it would have been 200*l*.

No Persons prefer'd under that Government but the *Duke's Friends and Devotees*; Men who had a Protestant Outside, but could transform 'emselfs into any Figure, and frame their Face to all Occasions.

IN that Reign was a Multiplicity of Tests and Oaths devis'd against Papists, but even in their collective Force were not potent enough to prevent the Growth of Popery then, nor the actual Entry of that evil Spirit in *King James's* time: and without a timely Recourse had to a certain Presbyterian State, Popery, that *Italian Demon*, had remained still in Possession of

of the Land, and *England* would have been made a *Province to Rome*. So that in Truth, this Combination of Tests, contriv'd against *Rome*, serv'd only to divide Protestants, and to bring *Rome* nearer to *London*.

4. *THE Rescue of the Church out of these Calamities to which she was reduced by the Test-takers (in King Charles and King James's time) was by Presbyterian Protestants, witness the Revolution.*

THE Glorious Revolution, by which we were deliver'd from *Wooden Shoes and Wooden Gods*, was not brought about by the Power nor the Principles of the Church, whose Maxims were Non-resistance and Passive-obedience ; but by a Set of Principles borrow'd from Protestant Dissenters. The Church, is so good as to acknowledge the Obligation, and so honest as to pay Interest duly, witness our *Liberty* ; but we cannot acknowledge the Principal to be received while the Test remains.

THE People of England, 'tis true, had no small Difficulties to struggle with at the Revolution : Being not only sworn to King *James*, but they had solemnly renounced the Revolution-Principles by taking that monstrous Oath, viz.

“ *THAT* it was not lawful upon any Pre-
 “ tence whatsoever to take Arms against the
 “ King,—and that they would not at any Time
 “ endeavour any Alteration of Government,
 “ either in Church or State.”

A

A lamentable Dilemma! Either to supersede the Obligation of an Oath, or suffer the Shipwreck of their Holy Religion. The Dissenters seeing the impious Tendency of this Oath, cautiously avoided the Snare.

IN the Years 1687-8. Matters were brought to a *Crisis: Popery or Protestantism.* The Church, being brought to Extremity of Distress, implor'd the Assistance of the *Prince of Orange*, a *Dutch Presbyterian*, who indeed was the only Person that was in a condition to save her, by the Interest he had in the States General, who in their Sentiments are professed Presbyterians. The Elector of *Brandenburgh*, Landgrave of *Hesse-Cassel*, Duke of *Zell*, King of *Sweden*, all of the Presbyterian Persuasion, came heartily into the Scheme, and generously offer'd to supply the *States* with any Number of Troops which they should send to *England* with the Prince, *in Defence of the Church of England*; that could not keep out Popery by the Test, nor drive it out after it had enter'd, but by the Assistance of *Presbyterians*.

THE Clergy then were come to a good Temper, desir'd the *Prince of Orange* to send over some of the *Dissenting Ministers*, whom the Violence of former Years had driven into *Holland*, to take care of those of their own Denomination, that none of 'em might be wheedl'd by the Court, as Mr. *Lobb* had been. Upon which the Prince sent over the Reverend Mr. *How*, and Mr. *Shower*, in whose Retinue
were

were many others to whom his *Highness* was very generous.

Dr. *Sancroft* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, while under a Cloud, sent certain Articles to his Clergy, in which he exhorted 'em thus, *viz.* " to have a tender regard to our
 " Brethren the Protestant Dissenters, to visit
 " 'em, to treat 'em fairly where ever they meet
 " 'em — — and in the last place, warmly
 " and most affectionately to exhort 'em to
 " joyn with us in daily fervent Prayer to
 " the God of Peace, for an universal blessed
 " Union of all Reformed Churches at home and
 " abroad, against our common Enemies, &c."

5. WHEN 'twas in their Power to distress the Church, and they were tempted thereto by the King himself, they abhorr'd the Motion, and firmly adher'd to her in her greatest Danger.

THO they were treated with the utmost Barbarity, yet their Oppressors could never provoke 'em to rebel, or address the Government for Liberty, both which their Enemies had in view. The Dissenters knew the Design of the Court was to introduce Popery by a general Toleration, therefore would not petition for it. When such a thing came out, some thank'd the King for throwing open the Prison Doors; and in so doing, perhaps, did no more than their Censurers would have done in the like case.

WHEN courted by King *James*, they had an opportunity to revenge themselves on the Church;

Church ; but did they make Reprisals ? did they discover any Ill Nature ? Nothing like it.

WHEN incens'd to be outrageous (Oppression will make wise Men mad) did they ever alarm the Government by Insurrections ? Did they ever so much as break a Church-window ?

UNDER a long Scene of Hardships they rather chose to submit to those who injur'd 'em, than joyn with others to crush their Oppressors. After they had long and in vain cry'd to their Judges for Abatement of exorbitant Fines, the Enlargement of guiltless Prisoners, for some Compassion to their poor Families that were ready to starve for want of Bread, they sat down quietly with a scornful and cruel Refusal.

Now how can they be said to be Enemies to the Church, who join'd with her in her greatest Dangers, as I have prov'd ; and would not hurt her, at a time when it was in their Power, to contribute towards her Destruction ? They abhor'd the Thought, and rejected the almost invincible Temptation of *Revenge* : and if they are not Enemies, why should they share the Treatment of such ?

II. *Arguments for the Repeal.*

HAVING prov'd by historical Facts, that the Danger of the Church has been from the Sacramental-Test-takers, and her Deliverance by the Dissenters, which one would think were sufficient to silence all Pleas in favour of the

Test.

Test. I now proceed to those Topicks, that plead for the Reasonableness of the Repeal.

WHAT the Dissenters generally offer upon this head, may be reduced to three things.

1. THEY *complain of the Illegality of its Application.*

2. THAT *it intrenches on the Legislative Power of Christ.*

3. THAT *it's an Encroachment upon the Rights of Mankind.*

1. THE *Protestant Dissenters complain of the Illegality of its Application.*

THIS Law was made against Popish Recusants; Dissenters are not chargeable with those Popish Principles, that were the Reasons of this Law, and yet Friends and Enemies, innocent and Guilty are equally punish'd by it: the Characters, tho vastly different, are made one in Punishment.

THE Exclusion of Protestant Dissenters was never intended by the Contrivers of this Scheme, which in the Letter of it has no Relation to 'em: and how the Edge of it has been turn'd against 'em in Reigns Popishly affected, is no Riddle; since the Ruin of Dissenters was only a Preface to the Destruction of the Church, as Archbishop King has prov'd in his *Sermon upon the Reduction of Ireland.*

THE *Test-Act* (as the Preamble shews) was formed as a *Barrier against Popery*; and to persecute Dissenters upon it is directly contrary to the End propos'd by the Inventors of that Bill: so sensible was the Parliament at last

of this wrong Application of the Law, that (before it was dissolved) A. D. 1681. Two remarkable Votes were carry'd in the House of Commons, *viz.*

1. THAT *the Laws, made against Recusants, ought not to be extended against any but those of the Church of Rome*; which was the Primary Intention of that Law.

2. THAT *the Prosecution of the Dissenters upon the Penal Laws is at this Time grievous to the Subjects, a Weakening the Protestant Interest, an Encouragement to Popery* N. B. By those two Votes my Proposition is abundantly confirm'd.

YET was the *Test-Act*, and other Laws made against Papists, turn'd against Dissenters: Thus, a *Test against Popery* is (by an Art peculiar to some sort of Mortals) *transform'd into a Test of Protestants against Protestants.*

TRUE indeed there was a Bill that pass'd both Houses in their Favour, but it *was stolen out of the House of Lords*, and could not be found when other Bills had the Royal Assent; upon which Sir *William Jones* (suppos'd to be the greatest Lawyer in the Kingdom) made an elegant Speech, and among other things he saith,

“ Be the Bill what it will, the Precedent is
 “ of the highest Consequence. The King has
 “ his Negative to all Bills; but I never knew
 “ that the Clerk of the Parliament had a Ne-
 “ gative — if this Way be found out, that Bills
 “ shall be thrown by, it may be hereafter said

“ they

“ they are forgot and laid by, and we should
 “ never know whether the King would pass ’em
 “ or no.”

ARE *Protestants, as such, to be punish’d by
 Laws made against Papists, as Papists, whose
 Principles are destructive of Protestant Go-
 vernments ?*

IF not, why then is so considerable a Body
 of Protestants put on the Level with them?
 Why that Note of Disgrace, by which they
 are number’d with Papal Transgressors, put up-
 on them? Is the Church more opposite to Po-
 pery, or more faithful to the Government than
 Protestant Dissenters? I trow not.

WE go out, say the Dissenters, with the Church
 in her Battles against *Rome*, and when we return,
 we are doom’d to our old Station, which is to
 be *Hewers of Wood, and Drawers of Water
 to the Camp*. Thus are they sentenced to their
 Drudgery, while others divide the Spoils.

2. ANOTHER Complaint against the Test is,
*that it seems to intrench upon the Regal Po-
 wer of Christ in the Government of the Church.*

WHEN our Lord instituted that Sacred Or-
 dinance, it was for Religious, and not for Se-
 cular Preferments. Dare any, who name the
 Name of Christ, say it was the Will of Christ,
 that Christians should take the Holy Commu-
 nion for a Place of Profit? *Not one Dash of this
 World in his Kingdom*; his Rewards are not
 the High Places of the Earth. Yea, so far was
 he (who was the best Judge of things) from
 influencing Men to be of his Sentiments in Re-

ligion by the Decoy of Temporal Gain, that he represents the State of the Church as militant and persecuted.

Now, to convert this Institution into a worldly use, to which Christ had no view ; doth it not rival him in his Legislative Power ? He instituted a Religious Feast, to be us'd in memory of *his Death*, and by this Act 'tis made a Sacrament in memory of *this world*.

NOTHING secular or selfish ever appear'd in the Conduct of the Lord and Head of the Church. His genuine Disciples were baptiz'd into the same Spirit.

Is there no other way to the Seats of humane Glory and Gain, but by the Ordinance of One, whose Doctrine and Practice was invariably pointed against both ? Is there even a Shadow of Propriety in going to Christ's Table for worldly Purposes, when his Kingdom is not of this World ?

Q. WHETHER Christian Magistrates have Power to alter the Laws of Christ, and convert 'em to other Uses and Ends, than he has appointed and appropriated them to ?

THE *Religion of Jesus* needs no secular Props. It stands upon the immoveable Pillars of its innate Excellencies. *They* are humane Devices introduced into a Church, that lack the Sanction of humane Tests and Fancies.

THE *Religion of the true Church* is the *Religion of Jesus*, who never propos'd secular Allurements to invite Men to his Altar, nor did he ever authorize his Servants to do so.

How

How then, *oh ye Ministers of Jesus!* how can you sit still, and not denounce your Anathemas against those, who profane the sacred Institution? Why don't you address our Legislators for the Redress of so enormous a Grievance; I am persuaded most of those, who are the brightest Ornaments of the Church, would join in the Remonstrance.

Is not the Glory of this Ordinance departed, by the daily Contempt put upon it by profane Receivers, I mean for worldly Preferment? How many Pearls (since the Demolition of the Sacred Inclosure) have been the Entertainment of Swine? Is it not to be suspected, that this practice has contributed something towards the growth of *Deism*, and Profaneness?

Q. Whether the erecting a Christian Institution into a civil Office for Preferment, has not a Tendency to lessen Man's Veneration for it?

CHRISTIANITY is at a low ebb in some Places; and how can it be reviv'd in those Places, while the Crown of its Glory is profan'd?

THERE are no Nations but have the Names and *Dictates* of their Gods in *high Veneration*. The Duke of *Holstein's* Ambassador in his *Persian-Travels* tells us, " That when he visited their Colleges, one of the Regents perceiving he had engraven on his Cane in *Arabic* these Words, *In the Name of the Merciful God*, he desir'd the Ambassador to bestow it upon him, promising to give him

“ a better—the Regent immediately cut out
 “ the word *Alla, God*, and put it in a clean
 “ paper, saying, The Name of God should
 “ not be on a Staff thrust in the dirt.”

By the Laws of the antient Heathens, the profane were driven away from their Sacrifices by the Herald, crying, *procul ite profani*.

AFTER all; little Stress is to be laid on *Magistratical Tests*. The old Lord *Hallifax* speaking of this Subject says — “ that as there
 “ was really no Security to any State by
 “ Oaths; so also no Person would ever order
 “ his Affairs, as relying on it. No Man would
 “ ever sleep with open Doors, or unlock’d up
 “ Treasure, should all the Town be sworn,
 “ not to rob. — that the use of multiplying
 “ Oaths had been most commonly us’d, to ex-
 “ clude or disturb some honest conscientious
 “ Men who would never have prejudiced the
 “ Government.” —*vid. a letter from a Person*
of Quality. (p. 14. Printed A. D. 1675.)
 revis’d by Mr. *Lock*.

MEN of real Probity need not the Sacred Tye of an Oath; and as to Men of profligate Minds, to think of securing ’em by Tests and Oaths, is to bind *Samson* with the Twigs of a Withy. An Oath is one of the strongest Securitys to a Government, and is a superadded Obligation on Conscience; but of what use is it among those, who have no Conscience at all?

IN their turns, all Parties have made *powerful Essays* this way, to secure their *Churches by humane Tests*, but all in vain, *e. g.*

WHAT Security had the Presbyterians from the *Test of solemn League and Covenant*? tho King *Charles II.* took it three times in *Scotland*, and was a sworn Presbyterian; yet when elevated to the Throne, regarded it no more than an obsolete Statute.

YEA, both *Lords and Commons* took the *Scot's Covenant* in *St. Margaret's Church, Westminster*, Sept. 25. 1645. but with what success the Event shews.

WHAT Security had the Rump Parliament by their *Test*, call'd *Engagement*, being an Oath appointed to be taken by all in Office or Benefice, *to be true to the Government establish'd, without King, or House of Peers.*

N. B. MOST of the Presbyterian Ministers, and moderate Churchmen, refus'd this Oath; and many Episcopal Divines not only took it, but pleaded for it in print, *Baxter's Abridg.* Vol. I. Edit. 2. pag. 63.—

WHAT Security had *Richard Cromwell* and his Adherents by the *Recognition-Test*, tho proclaim'd Protector by universal Consent? He soon saw himself depos'd, and forsaken by his own Friends.

AND what Security the Church of *England* had from the Sacramental Test, we have already seen. Did not the *Revolution* turn out the *Popery*, that was brought in under the *Umbrage of the Test*, in the Days of King *Charles II.* and
King

King *James II*? In the late Rebellion against King *George I*. did not the Test Men join with Papists in that bloody Attempt, to overthrow the Church?

3. THE Test as apply'd, looks as if *it were injurious to the Rights of Mankind, considered in all their Aspects. Governours and Governed are affected by this Sacramental Limitation of Offices.*

THE Test has the Appearance of an *Encroachment upon the Rights of Caesar.*

FOR, by this Exclusive Act, the King is deny'd the Privilege common to all his Subjects, which is a Power to chuse his own Servants from any Denomination; but he is confin'd to one Party only, and he has no *Protestant Enemies* but among that Party.

THO the Test-Act sets Marks of Humiliation upon the Clergy, yet by that very same Act the Church triumphs over her Lay-members, who by that very Act are fasten'd to the horns of the Altar, there being, by that Act, no way to the *Temple of Honour*, but thro' the *Chancel*.

THE Power of preferring Persons is in the King, but his *Commission* must receive its *final Sanction* from the Church: for no Man has a legal Title to his place, without receiving the Lord's Supper according to the Usage of the Church, which brings into my Mind a modern Story, *viz. A certain Monarch* having seen a curious Watch, ask'd the Maker if he would make such another, who answer'd affirmatively; where-

whereupon the Monarch said I'll make thee my Watch-maker : *I am obliged to thee, oh King,* said the ingenious Artificer, *but that is not in thy Power, the Church will not allow it.* Why, reply'd the King, *what has the Church to do with making of Watches ?*

ON the other hand, the King's Subjects apprehend themselves injur'd by it ; both Conformists and Nonconformists.

It's no little Uneasiness to some good Men in the Church, that they can't serve their Country, without making a divine Institution stoop to the force of humane Authority. Harder yet, that a profane Creature must either starve for want of Bread, or eat and drink his own Damnation.

THE Inferior Clergy must needs complain of Hardships, since by this Act they are oblig'd to give the Holy Communion to every one that demands it, as the last Criterion of the Fitness required by Law for Preferment ; and the Clergyman who denies it, even to the Heterodox and vicious is punishable by the Law.

HERE is a double Privation. The *Parochial Minister* is hereby divested of his power to judge of the Fitness of Communicants for that Ordinance ; which Power is included in the pastoral Office, and confirmed to him by the Act of Uniformity. *Order for the administration of the Lord's Supper.* The Church also is depriv'd of its Spiritual Jurisdiction by a Political Transmutation.

F

BUT

BUT those I have principally in view here, are Protestant Dissenters ; who suffer by the Test in their natural, moral, religious and political Rights.

BY this Act, they apprehend, their natural Rights are invaded: for, by nature they are upon the same Level, and upon the same Terms, as their conforming Neighbours ; and, as I have proved, they have done nothing to forfeit this natural Privilege.

BESIDES, as they are Natives of *England*, they are equally entitled with their Countrymen to all the Privileges of freeborn Subjects. To deny them this, is to put 'em on the same Foot with *Aliens*.

IF Dissenters can produce Men, that are as well quallify'd as others, to serve the Government, with regard to Intellectuals; then an Exclusion of 'em is injurious to that Right, when their Prince stands in need of their personal Service.

THEIR moral Character, as Christians and Protestants, should at least skreen them from any Infringement of their natural Rights, the Conservation of which is the great End of civil Government, and that without Partiality or sideing with Parties.

AND, as in Politicks, Dissenters are Orthodox, and constant Conformists to the State, I see no Reason why they should not put in their claim of Right to a Capacity to serve it. And don't they contribute towards the Support of the

the Government as well as others? where then lies the Justice of the Exclusion?

TRUE, they are Nonconformists as to the Church, and one would think, to exclude them from Ecclesiastical Preferment were Mortification enough for their Dissent. But why should a Conformist to the State be excluded from State-Offices and Trust?

WHY should the Rewards of the State be annexed to one Opinion more than another, when that *one Opinion* has nothing in it that's more propitious to the State, or more meritorious of publick Favours?

“ AN *English* Man can't be reduced to a
 “ more unhappy Condition, than to be put by
 “ Law under an Incapacity of serving his Prince
 “ and Country; and therefore nothing but a
 “ Crime of the most detestable Nature ought
 “ to put him under such a Disability,” say the
Lords in their Conference with the *Commons*,
Veneris 8 die Januarii 1702.

Q. *Whether any Magistrates have Power to divest Men of their natural Privileges, who have made no Forfeiture of them?*

SIR *William* being ask'd by my Lord—
Whether going to a Meeting-house, or unconsecrated Place of Worship be a Sin? answer'd, that in his Apprehension, Consecration of Places added no Virtue to Devotion. That any House set apart for sacred uses is as holy as any Church. For nothing can make a Place holy but the Divine Presence, and when that

is departed, the Place is common. *Jerusalem and the Temple* witness to this Truth. Sincere Worshippers are equally accepted in all Places.

IF any should think better of their *Religion*, because 'tis *establish'd by Law*, I wish they may have Capacity enough to be religious without Superstition. But if you take Dissenters even in that Light, in going to their Meeting-house, you go to a Place that is Sacred to Worship, and has the Sanction of the Law, under the Protection of which they assemble and worship.

THE Liberty given them for their publick Worship is by Law, and that Law is part of the Establishment. The Difference between the Dissenters Churches, and the Episcopal, lies here; that certain stated Preferments are annexed to the Laws made in favour of the Church, but not to those which tolerate the Dissenters.

THERE is something so intoxicating in the Word *Establishment*, that some People can't think of it, but it gives 'em the *Vertigo*. Others take *Establishment* and *Infallibility* to be synonymous Terms, and Things that are inseparable. *Turcism and Popery* are establish'd by Law; therefore *Turks and Papists*, say they, are in the right, and all others in the wrong.

I have read of a certain *Heathen*, who after he had shew'd the Folly and Impiety of the Pagan Religion, *establish'd in the Nations*, yet concludes ——— *Quæ omnia sapiens servabit, tanquam legibus jussa, non tanquam deis grata;*
that

that is, *All which a wise Man will observe as establish'd by Law, not imagining them grateful to the Gods.*

Now judge from the whole, how little the Church is obliged to the *Test for Shelter*. Many of those who got great Places by the Test, have impiously made use of their Power to overthrow the Church; while others whose Christian Caution would not allow 'em to Test it, have been her steady Friends. One defends the Church without taking the Test, the other by taking the Test, betrays the Church.

IT naturally follows, where Reason predominates, that if the *Strength* of a Law is not equal to the Design of it, what is there that forbids the Repeal of it; especially when innocent Men are Sufferers by it.

IF by the Sacramental Law, Enemies and false Friends are not excluded from Beneficial Stations; why should this Law remain in force against those, who are the acknowledged Friends of the Government? what is this, but to ordain a Law, which is of no Efficacy against the Enemies of the Church, and at the same Time is a notorious Injury to the rightful Claim of its true Friends: so I must style the Dissenters I plead for, and so they'll appear to be to every impartial Reader.

WHAT has the temporal Power to do about Religion? It's no part of the Magistrate's Province, by Coercive Laws to impose his Religion

gion upon his Subjects, or to punish any, that differ from him in Religious Sentiments.

IN a Word, thus we have seen, that tho the Protestant Religion be the Glory of our Land, yet upon all that Glory the *Test* has not been able to create a Defence.



F I N I S.

nat

ho
ur
ot